App F IX—4

Previous References

Con Dep no 395/54

(1954 SI
Cm

Later References

File No 44-SI

Serial Nos 6, 7,
22,

MYSORE GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos 5 P-24
B

Part B for Sept 1955

SUBJECT

Petition of Sri B K Ramakrishnaiy -
Municipal Councillor Kolar city Municipal Corp
Complaint in the matter of a Meeting
the President, city Municipal Council

WD 0249—GPB—25 000—16 9 55

L 7197 5 9 55

The Municipal Commissioner
Kolar city Municipality
Complaints to Pos

Mysore Government Secretariat

LCC 5-171

File No. of 195

[App F III 2

Serial No

Petition dated 17 12 52 from Sri B K Rama Krishnama, Municipal Councillor, Mysore City, Mfg- requesting Clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President- Sri Kotthi Mysore City- At the Annual Municipal City- at the ordinary General meeting of the Mysore City-Mfg held on 30 x 52 over-- ruling the point of order- raised by the appln Councillor-

Orders of the Dy Secy thereon --
Get a Report- and Examine Whether the ruling given is Correct-
— Asst —

(Sd) L S V K Rao
20/12

Submitted with drafts for approval
28/12 29/12
30 31/12
2

3) Issue
1/1

To The Mfg Commr Mysore City- Mfg
L 18806/C.A 46-52-7 Dt 20-1-53
Calls for a Report

Sec A
20/1

Note—Contn Sheet

Petition from Sri B K Ramakrishnaya seeking certain clarification in the matter of Re-ing given by the President

File No 6805/M1 101 of 195

Mysore Government Secretariat

Serial No

4) Putup regarding Re: the ruling given by the President M C Mysore — letter from Sri B K Ramakrishnaiah M C Mysore

7/2/58

5) Submitted with the file for kind perusal. As per orders at para 1 supra a Report has been called for from the M Comm Mysore City M/C. No Report is received so far — He has been reminded today & 2nd & 6 Reminders in 8 days

7/2/58

Sd/-

Sd/- 24/2

From

The M Comm Mysore City M/C

C2 PR 224 C932/58-59 dt 28-3-58

Furnishes the Report.

7. The Report of the M Comm is for perusal. The Conclusion of the petitioner is that Section 14

Petition from Sri B K Ramakrishnaya seeking
the protection in the matter of ruling given 3
by the President — of 195

Mysore Government
Secretariat

[App F III 2

Serial No

The C M Act empowers the Council to recommend to the Govt the removal of any Councillor under certain specified circumstances and even then the Govt may remove him after giving him an opportunity of being heard and after such enquiry as it deems necessary. Thus, the power given to the Council is a very limited one and the reference of the President that Section 14 of the Act gives power to the Council to censure a Councillor for his alleged unfortunate many Conduct within and without the Council is too far fetched and untenable.

Note that He has further A ruling based on such a far fetched interpretation vested in the hands of unscrupulous members, be a dangerous weapon to harass respectable members of the Council

8) The ruling given by the Pll President at the Council meeting held on 30 10 52 in this behalf as flagged P

9) A report on the petition of Sri B K Ramakrishnaya was called for the Pll Commr on his report has stated as follows —

" A Councillor desiring to dispute the ruling of the President may bring forward a proposition at the following Meeting under Rule 5(6) of Chapter II of the Mysore

NOTE — Contn sheet

6805, 10.

Declaration from Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya DM Councillor seeking clarification in the matter of rulings given by the Presidents - Mysore City - Municipal

File No 14 of 197 | Mysore Government Secretariat

Serial No

- City Municipal Rules and Byelaws Hence the provision under which Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya seeks the relief may kindly be intimated for further action in the matter."

10 Rule 5 - (h) of the DM Rules & Byelaws of the City - DM Council - Mysore contemplates as follows -

5 (h) A Councillor called to order by the presiding authority shall resume his seat - till the decision of the point of order raised provided that the presiding authority may allow the member to speak on the point of order raised If any Councillor desires to dispute the decision of the presiding authority, he may bring forward a proposition at the following meeting.

As stated by the DM Commissioner para 9 supra. there is no provision under law to seek relief as far as the present matter is concerned

11 As per rule 5 (h) of the DM Rules & Byelaws he may bring a proposition

WD 07074-CTI-80 CCC-5 10 51

10)

Petition from Sri B.K Ramakrishnayya, MI Councillor seeking Clarification in the matter of Ruling given by the President during

at the following meeting 842 Law 80 06

12 However, the Law Secty may be requested to offer their remarks on the ~~facts stated~~ Ruling given in the petition preferred by the MI respondent Mysore in regard to the interpretation of Section 14 of the C M Act 1933

JS 23/4 SO 26/4

Amended Story 2/5

13) Section 14 deals with the removal of a MI cl^r and not with the censures to be passed against the conduct of a MI cl^r The ruling given by the President is not correct

14) Sri B K Ramakrishnayya could have approached the D C in the matter and requested them to exercise her powers under Section 218 of the C M Act Govt need not pass orders at this stage If appd, Sri Ramakrishnaiah will be informed accordingly

5/5/55

Secy (Rdr + Dy)

15) For Go remarks -

D 5/5/55

Law Sec)

5/5

16) No censure motion against a Municipal councillor may come

EDUCATION STATE GOVERNMENT 2087 5 MAY 1955

14/5/55

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT LAW DEPARTMENT 1377 1955

Law 9/5/55

dt 9/5/55

Pet^n from Sri B K Ramakrishnaya - Ml Councillor
Seeking Clarification in the matter of ruling
given by the President Mysore City Mcty
Vr 10/m

making the Provisions of Section 14 of the City Municipalities
Act which Relates to the Power of the Govt to Remove
Municipal Councillors for Misdemeanours & Agree with
the Views expressed at Para 13 supra.

Secretary — L S G) cm
28/6/57



17(a) MKR
17/5/57

17) The remarks of the Law Dept are for perusal A draft letter as to the Ml Counsr and an endorsement to the petn are put up for approval of other orders

MS
6/7

18) Orders may perhaps be communicated to Sri Ramakrishnaya in the letter form, as this form was adopted last time when the receipt of the letter was acknowledged The two draft letters are for Govt orders

x please see page

Mrs 6/7

19) Two drafts for appl

MS
9/7



Secy (Govt & L Dept)

20) In terms of the petition which is sought for at the hands of Govt Govt under what provision of the C M A is Govt to give relief ?

14/7/57
MGM

6805) 10/8

Petition of Sri B K Ramakrishnaya, Municipal Councillor seeking Clarification on the matter of Ruling given by the President —

21) There is no specific provision in the Act by which the petitioner can get relief at the hands of Govt However he can bring forward a proposition in the next meeting under Rule 5(b) of the Municipal Rules and Byelaws of Mysore City disputing the Ruling of the President It has now been proved that the ruling given by the President is not correct This may perhaps be conveyed to the petitioner

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH & LOCAL GOVERNMENT
11 AUG
No 2162

22) The decision taken in the ruling given, if conveyed, will be helpful for future guidance in such matters

M 28/7

23) The Govt have no powers to pass an original order because there has to pass an interim order under section 216 of the M Act, yet nothing is lost nor gained, in giving instructions to the Comr on certain procedural matters of appeal, the Comr will be informed of this matter while sending an endorsement to Sri B K Ramakrishnaya

Secy Edn & L-Govt

24) Issued with the Govt Confirmation

Pl c
Pursuant to the C.M. Ref
B 6/8/52

6809
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Ministry) he seeks relief

10/8/52

Pet:- of Sri B.K. Ramakrishnaiya MC Councillor
seeking clarification w.r.t. the ruling of a ruling given by the
Pt CMC Mysore 10/Dec-

---

25) There is no harm in apprising the Municipal Council of 2162
the correct interpretation of Section 14. I do not think that
Sri Ramakrishnaiya has sought any relief at the hands of Govern-
ment. He may be told that the ruling given by the President
was not correct and that if he had wished to dispute the ruling
of the President, he could have brought forward a proposition
Hes 2. at the very next meeting of the Municipal Council under Rule 5
of Chapter II of the Municipal Council Rules and Bye-laws.



20.8.65
22.8.65
23.8.

26) Two drafts typed, Typist Examiner's
Initials

Hes 2/9 27) Put up typed drafts today
7/9

Pl put up the Rules Bye laws Reforms to above
7/9

28) Table-cost & typed drafts for approval
9/9

Issue
10/9

A copy of the Mysore Municipal Rules & Bye-laws as put up Hes 9/9

To
The Municipal Commissioner Mysore City-Mysore
L 7157/CM 66-67-22
Dt 5.9.65.
Clarification Letter

To
Sri B.K. Ramakrishnaiya M.A.L.L.B
Municipal Councillor
967, Lakshmipuram, Mysore 1
L 7198/CM 66-67-23 Dt 5.9.65
Copy to The Municipal Commissioner Mysore City-Mysore.

Hes

Get a report and examine whether the ruling given is correct

6505-

(1)

Before the Minister for Law Local Self Government,
Bangalore
0

C M 44-54-6

Applicant - Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, Retired District Judge and Municipal Councillor, Mysore City
--o--

In the matter of a ruling given by the President, Mysore City Municipality at the ordinary General meeting of the Mysore City Municipal Council held on 30-10-1954 overruling the point of order raised by your applicant
----0----

1 Sri Doddathammegowda, one of the members of the Municipal Council moved a Resolution on 30-10-54 to censure the ~~conduct~~ alleged ungentlemanly conduct of another Municipal Councillor Sri Aziz Sait on 15-10-54, during the Council meeting and also after the Council meeting (but in the Municipal building) on that date The resolution was duly seconded by Sri M K Lingiah

2 A point of order was raised by your petitioner that the resolution was not in order as the Municipal Councils have no power to sit in judgment upon or censure the conduct of their members as no such power is given to them by the City Municipalities Act, 1933 or by the general Law Your petitioner also pointed out that Section 14 of the Act was only recommendatory in character and related to a different set of circumstances and had no bearing on the present question After elaborate discussion by various members, the President gave a ruling that Section 14 of the Act gave power to the Council to consider a resolution of the type in question and did not uphold the point

P T O

(2)

contd - 2 -

point of order raised by your petitioner It is against this ruling (an authenticated copy of the same is submitted herewith) that this petition is being submitted

3 Primafacie, Section 14 of the Act empowers the Council to recommend to the Go ernment the removal of any Councillor under certain specified circumstances and even then the Government may remove him after gi ing him an opportunity of being heard and after such inquiry as it deems necessary Thus, the power given to the Council is a very limited one and the inferece of the President that Section 14 of the Act gi es power to the Council to censure a Councillor for his alleged ungentlemanly conduct within and without the Council is too far fetched and untenable A ruling based on such a far fetched interpretation would, in the hands of unscrupulous members, be a dangerous weapon to harass respectable mer bers of the Council

4 The reasons given by the President in ruling out the point of order raised are untenable and illegal and ultravires of the provisions of the Act

5 In these circumstances, your petitioner submits that the records and the proceedings concerned may be sent for and a correct interpretation of the position as contended by your petitioner may be sent over to the President and he be directed to revise his ruling accordingly

Mysore,
Dated 17-12-1951

B K Ramakrishnaiya

MUNICIPAL COUNCILLOR

(3)

CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
P B No 17
Mysore, Dated 11-12-1954

No
Encls C. PR 198-C 703/54-55
copy of the Ruling

FROM The Municipal Commissioner,
City Municipal Council,
MYSORE

To Sri B K.Ramakrishnaiya, M.A ,LL.B ,
Municipal Councillor,
947, Lakshmipuram, Mysore

Dear sir,

Ref Your letter dated 11-11-1954 for a copy of the ruling given by the President at the council meeting held on 30-10-54

I send herewith the above, as desired by you.

Yours faithfully,

Municipal Commissioner

Councillor -

(4)

" ಇ 15-10 1954 ನೇ ಇಕ್ಕ್ರವಾರ ನಡೆದ ಪೌರಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಶಾಸನ ಪುರಸ್ಕೃತ ಭವನದಲ್ಲಿ, ಪೌರಸಭಾಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಆಜೀವ ನೇಮಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ದೊಡ್ಡಥಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡರು ಮತ್ತು ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಕುಂಗು ಬರುವಂತೆ ಅಧಿಕೃತರಿಯಿಂದ ವರ್ತಿಸಿದುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಖಂಡಿಸುತ್ತದೆ "

Moved by Sri Doddathammegowda
Seconded by Sri M K Lingiah

Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya raised a point of order that there was no provision to bring in a resolution of the kind Discussion having been allowed on the point of order, some members expressed their opinion on the same The President then gave the following Ruling

" Sri Doddathammegowda has moved a resolution which is included in the agenda as subject No 830 and it was seconded by Sri M K Lingiah A point of order was raised by Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, stating that it is not in order The matter was discussed at great length by the council The point is whether Secn 14 of the Act empowers a member to table a resolution of this kind for discussion before this House

During the course of the discussion I brought to the notice of the council the following passage in Doreswamy Iyengar's Law of Municipal Corporations

' Municipal Councils have no power to sit in judgment upon or censure the conduct of their members, where no such power is given them by statute or by the general law "

I requested the members to enlighten me on the point whether such a power is given to the municipal council by Section 14 of the C M Act or by the general law Secn 14 empowers the council to consider a resolution recommending for the removal of a member 'if such a member has been guilty of misconduct in the discharge of his duties o of any disgraceful conduct or has become incapable of performing his duties as a member " It was pointed out that this is rather a very serious point which would affect the rights of the members I no doubt see that the passing of such a resolution would certainly affe t a member The resolution relates to not only the privilege of a me ber but also the privilege of a House We are well aware of the practice obtaining in the legislatures Whenever a point concerning the privilege of a member or of the House is raised, as a specific issue, it is generally discussed in the legislatures and then referred to a Committee called the Committee of Privileges for a repo t The report of the Committee of Privileges is debated in the legislatures and suitable steps are taken to safeguard the privilege of the House or that of a member." I find from a very carf l reading of the Act and the byelaws that no such protection is given either to a member or to this House. The only protection I see is under Section 14. Section 14 refers to disgraceful conduct of a councillor also. No explanation or condition is attached to this phrase The resolution that is now before the House refers to the conduct of Sri Aziz Sait at the Meeting of the Municipal Council*and also in the Municipal Office premises.

(*on 15-10-54)

Resolutions that are passed in this House are all sent to Government for their information and needful action. This resolution (5) if adopted, is of course not recommending to the government for removal of a member for reasons stated in Section 14. It only amounts to an expression of its displeasure at his conduct. We usually record our appreciation for the services rendered by the members of this council or even other officers of the Municipality. This would be an expression of pleasure When such is the case, I do not think that would be far fetched to hold that the Council can also express its displeasure at the conduct of either a member of this council or other officers In the light of the foregoing reasons, I feel inclined to hold that the municipal council is empowered to sit in judgment upon or censure the conduct of its members under Secn 14 of the Act Even in other Body Corporations, as far as I am aware, such a practice exists and that is supported by general law relating to the democratic institutions I feel very unhappy that I am called upon to give a ruling on the resolution which relates to the conduct of one of my honourable colleagues in the council All the same, I have to hold that this resolution is in order and that there is no point in the objections raised by Sri B.K Ramakrishnaiya. Therefore I rule that Section 14 of the C.M.Act gives power to this council to consider a resolution of the type moved by Sri Doddathammegowda Discussions may now proceed on the merits of the resolution "

After some more discussion on the subject, the resolution was put to vote and passed 18 voting For and none against. Sri B K.Ramakrishnaiya observed that he and his side would ~~remain~~ refrain ~~neutral~~ from voting.

'copy'

(Sd) K Puttaswamy
President

MI Commissioner Mysore

(6)

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT Petition dated 17 12 54 from Sri B K Ramakrishnaya Retired District-Judge and Municipal Councillor, Mysore city—seeking certain Clarifications in the matter of a ruling given by the President-Mysore City-Mlly-at the ordinary General meeting of the Mysore City-Mll Council held on 30 10 54

Section C M

File No 44-54

Serial No 7

Diary No of letter replied to

No L 12806/20-1-55

To

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19*

The Mll Comm Mysore city-Mlly-
this the

Date of issue

Signed by

Sir,

In forwarding herewith a copy of petition dated 17 12 54 received from Sri B K Ramakrishnaya, Mll Councillor (Mysore city-Mll(s) on the above subject I am directed to request you kindly to forward a report on the matter at an early date

for Secretary to
Edn+Rds Depts

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 06818—GPB—25 000—9 7 49

(87)

L 12806/CM 44-54 -) - Mysore Government
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
20-1-55

Fducation and s

The Municipal Commissioner,
Mysore City Municipality
thro' the President

Subject Petition dated 17-12-1954 from Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, Retired District Judge and Municipal Councillor, Mysore City seeking certain clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President, Mysore City Municipality at the Ordinary General meeting of the Mysore City Municipal Council held on 30-10-1954

- - - -

In forwarding herewith a copy of petition dated 17-12-1954 received from Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, Municipal Councillor, on the above subject, I am directed to request you kindly to forward a report in the matter at an early date.

Yours faithfully,

(V Hanumarthappa)
for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G Departments

--- ---

*Sri Doddathammegowda, one of the members of the Municipal Council moved a resolution on 30-10-1954 to censure the alleged ungentlemanly conduct of another municipal councillor Sri Aziz Sait on 15-10-1954, during the Council meeting and also after the Council meeting (but in the Municipal building) on that date The resolution was duly seconded by Sri M K Lingiah

2 A point of order was raised by your petitioner that the resolution was not in order as the Municipal Councils have no power to sit in judgement upon or censure the conduct of their members as no such power is given to them by the City Municipalities Act 1933 or by the general Law Your petitioner also pointed out that section 14 of the Act was only recommendatory in character and related to a different set of circumstances and had no bearing on the present question After elaborate discussion by various members, the President gave ruling that section 14 of the Act gave power to the Council to consider a resolution of the type in question and did not uphold the point of order raised by your petitioner It is against this ruling (an authentiacated copy of the same is submitted herewith) that this petition is being submitted

3 Primafacie, Section 14 of the Act empowers the Council to recommend to the Government the removal of any Councillor under certain

(9)

specified circumstances and even then the Government may remove him after giving him an opportunity of being heard and after such enquiry as it deems necessary. Thus, the power given to the Council is a very limited one and the inference of the President that Section 14 of the Act gives power to the Council to censure a Councillor for his alleged ungentlemanly conduct within and without the Council is too far fetched and untenable A ruling based on such a far fetched interpretation would, in the hands of unscrupulous members, be a dangerous weapon to harass respectable members of the Council.

4. The reasons given by the President in ruling out the point of order raised are untenable and illegal and ultravires of the provisions of the Act.

5 In these circumstances, Your petitioner submits that the records and the proceedings concerned may be sent for and a correct interpretation of the position as contented by your petitioner may be sent over to the President and he be directed to revise his ruling accordingly *

COPY

knr-2/17 1

11 (9)

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT (1) Type the same subject as written on the first draft -

Section C-M
File No 44-54
Serial No 8

Diary No of letter replied to

No

To

Sri B K Ramakrishnaya
Retired District Judge
and M1 Councillor
947, Lakshmipuram
Mysore

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19*

Date of issue

Signed by

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your petition dated 17.12.54 addressed to the Minister for Revenue on the above subject and to state that the matter is receiving attention of Govt.

yours

for Secy to Govt.

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 06818—GPB—25 000—9 7 49

C2 PR 284-C 932
54-53

No
Encls

(10)

CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
P B No 17

Mysore, Dated 28-3-1955.

FROM

THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER,
City Municipal Council
MYSORE



To

The Secretary to Government,
Education and L S C Departments,
Bangalore 1

(Through the President)

Sir
1/4

Subject Petition of Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya Municipal Councillor, seeking clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President, City Municipal Council, Mysore

---

Ref Your letter No L 12806- dated 20-1-55

In para 5 of the Petition Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya has submitted that the records and the proceedings concerned may be sent for and a correct interpretation of the position as contended by him may be sent over to the President and he be directed to revise his ruling accordingly In this connection, reference is invited to this office letter No C2 PR 2/54-55 dated 7-12-1954 forwarding the proceedings of the meeting dated 30-10-1954 in the usual course Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya requests the Government to give a correct interpretation of Sec 14 of the Mysore City Municipalities' Act and to ask the President to revise his ruling in the light of the interpretation to be given by Government A Councillor desiring to dispute the ruling of the President may bring forward a proposition at the following meeting, under rule 5(b) of chapter II of the Mysore city Municipal Rules of Procedure Hence the provision under which Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya seeks the relief may kindly be intimated for further action in the matter

Hlg P 6547/M1 Sept 6/1/55 Depm 395

the matter

Yours faithfully,

(N Lakshman Rau)
Municipal Commissioner

Forwarded with compliments

(P Puttaswamy)
President

1

Subject Petition of Sri B 12/1
Ramakrishnaya. MC Councillor
seeking Clarification in the matter
of a Ruling given by the predecessor
of MC Council Pyone

To

The MC Council Pyone City-MC
thro' the Mayor

Sir

With reference to your letter no
C2 PR 284 C 932/54-55 dt 28 3 55 —
On the above subject I am directed
to state that Section 14 of the Pyone
CM Act 1933 deals with the removal
of a MC Councillor No Censure Motion
against a MC Councillor may come
within the purview of Section 14
of the said Act which relates
to the powers of the Govt to remove
a MC Councillor.
The Ruling given by the Mayor
is not ~~therefore~~ Correct

yrs

Sd/-
for Secretary to Govt
of Edn & LSG Depts

I DRAFT No L 7197/CM 44-54-2½-
A 15-9-55 13

Subject - Petition of Sri B V Ramakrishnaiya, Municipal Councillor, seeking clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President, City Mll Council, Mysore

To

The Municipal Commissioner,
Mysore City Municipality,
thro' the President

Sir,

With reference to your letter No C2 P R 284 C 932/54-55 dated 28-3-1955, on the above subject, I am directed to state that Section 14 of the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933 deals with the removal of a Municipal Councillor No censure motion against a Municipal Councillor may come within the purview of Section 14 of the said Act which relates to the powers of the Government to remove a Municipal Councillor

The ruling given by the President is ~~not~~ therefore correct

Yours faithfully,

for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G Departments

HGN /dft/8-9

14

No L 7197/CM 44-54-22

Dt 15-9-55

The
Education & L S G Departments

The Municipal Commissioner,
Mysore City Municipality
thro' the President.

Sir,

Subject Petition of Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, Municipal-Councillor, seeking clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President, City Municipal Council, Mysore

-.-

With reference to your letter No C2 P R 284 C 932/54-55 dated 28-3-1955 on the above subject, I am directed to state that Section 14 of the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933 deals with the removal of a Municipal Councillor No censure motion against a Municipal Councillor may come within the purview of Section 14 of the said Act which relates to the powers of the Government to remove a Municipal Councillor.

2 The ruling given by the President is therefore not correct.

Yours faithfully,

(V Hanumanthappa)
for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G Departments

knr-2/13 9

11

18

~~Endorsement from the Sr~~

To,

Sri B K Ramakrishnaya
BA LLB
Municipal Councillor,
No 47, Lakshmipuram
Mysore

Sir

With reference to your petition dated 17.12.52 seeking clarification in the matter of ruling given by the President, Mysore City-Municipal Council at the Ordinary General Meeting of the Municipal Council held on 30.4.52 overruling the point of order raised by you, I am directed to state that Government do not consider that it is necessary to intervene in the matter. You have approached the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District and requested him to exercise his powers under Section 218 of the City Municipal Act, 1933

By order

Ruling given by the President was not correct and that he has worked to dispute the ruling of the President, he should have brought forward a proposition at the very next meeting of the Municipal Council under Rule 5 of Chapter II of the Municipal Council Rules and Bye-laws

Copy to the Municipal Council Mysore City for information

Copy to the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District for information

No L 7198/ CR 44-54-23
II DRAFT & - 15-9-55

To

Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, M A ,LL B ,
Municipal Councillor,
947, Lakshmipuram,
Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your petition dated 17-12-1954, seeking clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President, Mysore City Municipal Council, at the ordinary General Meeting of the Municipal Council, held on 30-10-1954 over-ruling the point of order raised by you, I am directed to state that Government consider that the ruling given by the President was not correct and that if ~~he~~ you had wished to dispute the ruling of the President, ~~he~~ you could have brought forward a proposition at the very next meeting of the Municipal Council under Rule 5 of Chapter II of the Municipal Council Rules and Byelaws

Yours faithfully,

for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G Departments

Memo No L

Copy to - 7198 (a)
1 the Municipal Commissioner, Mysore City Municipality, thro' the President, for information

for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G Departments

HGM /dft/8-9

17

No L 7198/cm 44-54-23
dt 15-9-55

The
Education & L.S.G.Departments

Sri B K Ramakrishnaiya, M.A., LL.B.,
Municipal Councillor,
947, Lakshmipuram, Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your petition dated 17-12-1954, seeking clarification in the matter of a ruling given by the President, Mysore City Municipal Council, at the ordinary General Meeting of the Municipal Council, held on 30-10-1954 over-ruling the point of order raised by you, I am directed to state that Government consider that the ruling given by the President was not correct and that if ~~he~~ you had wished to dispute the ruling of the President, ~~You~~ he could have brought forward a proposition at the very next meeting of the Municipal Council under Rule 5 of Chapter II of the Municipal Council Rules and bye-laws.

Yours faithfully,

SD /V Hanumanthappa)
for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G.Departments.

knr-3/13 9

Memo No L 7198 (a) dt 15-9-55

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Municipal Commissioner, Mysore City Municipality thro' the President, for information

(V Hanumanthappa)
for Secretary to Government,
Education & L S G Departments